



University Courses and Curricula Committee 2023-2024

7 February 2024
Hosted Via Zoom
Call to Order: 1:15 PM

Members Present:

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Renee Harrington (Chair) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sarah Heckman | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Kim Duckett (proxy for Hannah Rainey) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Kanton Reynolds (Past Chair) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tamah Morant | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Peggy Domingue |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Melissa Merrill (proxy for Shannon Pratt-Phillips) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lara Pacifici (proxy for Kimberly Bush) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rachel Levy |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Travis Park | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lisa Parks (proxy for Whitney Jones) | <input type="checkbox"/> Christopher Jadelis |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cynthia Zuckerman-Hyman | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jonathan Duggins (Chair-Elect) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mihai Diaconeasa |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Kami Kosenko | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Helmut Hergeth | <input type="checkbox"/> Andy Fetch |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Kristen Schaffer | | <input type="checkbox"/> Kelsey Jenkins |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sarah Cannon | | |

Absent Members:

Guests: Holly Hurlburt, Bill Rand, Nathan Rowland (attending on behalf of William Fortney)

Ex-Officio Members Present: Li Marcus, Lexi Hergeth, Lydia Christoph, Sahil Bendale, Kyle Pysher, Charles Clift, Kaitlyn Mittan, Ontario Wooden, Samantha Polito, Joe Cannella

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

- **Remarks from Chair Renee Harrington** – Welcome and introduction of guests.
- **Remarks from OUCCAS/DASA** – The committee will meet in person on March 6th. A. Hergeth will speak at the end of the current meeting about the Admin Save Memo.
- **Approval of the UCCC Minutes from [DATE] – Approved**
Discussion: The motion was made and carried.

OLD BUSINESS

NEW BUSINESS

- **Consent Agenda - Approved**
Discussion: The motion was made and carried.
- **Animal Science (Minor) – Approved**
Discussion: This course was presented by Park, and seconded. The reviewers said it looked good. The motion carried.
- **SSC 428 / HS 428 : Soil Management Principles for Sustainable Agriculture – Approved Pending**
Discussion: This course was presented by Pratt Phillips's proxy Merrill. Reynolds asked how one would assess the "monitor[ing] [of] greenhouse gas fluxes from field and lab experiments" in the second-to-last Student Learning Outcome. Park proposed that students would perhaps report gas levels in a greenhouse. Reynolds asked for wording like "demonstrate proficiency in assessing gas levels in a greenhouse." Duggins asked if the objective was referring to "greenhouse gasses" or "gasses in a greenhouse," and requested that the objective give an example clarifying the type of gas. Mittan asked if the students could perhaps demonstrate proficiency in using tools to assess the gas, and why the students would be assessing the gas. Hergeth asked for further clarification in the objective. Reynolds moved to change the motion to "approved pending" with the sixth student learning outcome clarified, and that action carried. Kosenko mentioned that there was an "and" missing between "soil health" and "greenhouse gas" emissions in the course description. The motion to approve pending was seconded and passed.

- **Mechanical Electrical Systems – Approved**

Discussion: This course was presented by Heckman. The motion was seconded. The reviewers had no concerns. The motion carried.

- **Business Administration (BS): Business Analytics – Approved**

Discussion: This course was presented by Morant, and seconded. Levy mentioned there was strong student interest in the topic. Reynolds asked if this was a new concentration. Rand said this concentration only involved courses from within the college, although there was an exception for the option of a data science course. The motion carried.

- **BIO 240 : Principles of Human Anatomy & Physiology (A): Nervous, Skeletal, Muscular, & Digestive Systems – Approved with Suggestions**

Discussion: This course was presented by Duggins, and seconded. Heckman made a friendly suggestion to delete the sentence, “In addition, detailed learning outcomes for each system will be provided during the semester,” and add week ranges to the topic outline. Duggins stated that he was the only faculty member present from the COS in the meeting, and that the Biology and MEAS departments preferred not to receive this type of request. He respectfully declined the suggestion, but stated that he disagreed with the declension. Reynolds clarified that this was a suggestion and a best practice, but that not providing ranges assumed that the course would always be taught in the same way. Duggins explained that the faculty of the college wanted to be able to change the course whenever they wanted, but not to have to correspondingly change anything in CIM. Hergeth asked if this was one strong opinion in Biology and the College of Science, or a majority opinion. He said that biologists should understand evolution [of a course catalog system]. Levy explained that the COS seemed to want autonomy and flexibility, but that CIM was the mechanism for achieving this, which didn't seem to be connecting with the COS, because instead, they were achieving the opposite effect through their non-range preferences for CIM. Duggins emphasized the importance of CIM records for the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools accreditation. Marcus affirmed that the purpose of the OUCCAS roadshows was partly to explain this sort of thing to colleges, and that OUCCAS could work with friends in Assessment and potentially deans within the college to achieve this kind of change. Morant asked if the week range suggestion would even be made to COS, and was told that the suggestion would be recorded in the minutes. Reynolds then proposed rejecting the course proposal entirely until the COS could be helped to understand the necessity of adding ranges to CIM courses. Lisa Parks, the instructor, came in in the middle of the discussion and asked for a recap. Duggins explained how adding ranges in CIM would give the COS instructors flexibility and also fulfill SACS requirements. Parks asked if a range of weeks was suggested, and Morant confirmed this. Marcus reminded the committee why ranges were heavily recommended as a best practice. Hergeth reiterated that the committee was not trying to limit or dictate, but merely asking for clarification of relative weights. The motion carried, but there were 11/16 “yeas,” 4/16 “nays,” and one abstention.

- **BIO 242 : Human Anatomy and Physiology Laboratory – Approved with Suggestions**

Discussion: This course was presented by Duggins. Schaffer made a friendly suggestion for the second Student Learning Outcome to read “demonstrate safe use of appropriate laboratory tools” instead of “safely use appropriate laboratory tools...” Additionally, she remarked that the course length should be 15 rather than 16 weeks. Parks asked if the last two Learning Objectives were double-barrelled, particularly the last LO, and suggested that Parks split the two verbs into separate objectives, with Parks in understanding. Levy remarked that it was easy to see why these two objectives would go together. Levy asked about the number of contact versus credit hours, and Harrington clarified. Schaffer summarized the changes: adjustment to Learning Outcomes 2 and 3 to make them more measurable, 4 and 5 so that they would not be double-barrelled, and weeks ranges added. The motion was seconded and approved.

- **BIO 245 : Principles of Human Anatomy & Physiology (B): Endocrine, Cardiovascular, Respiratory & Renal Systems – Approved with Suggestions**

Discussion: This course was presented by Duggins and seconded. A week range suggestion was added. The motion carried.

Discussion: Discussion: Hurlburt spoke about QEP re-accreditation requirements. The QEP proposed asking students what makes something high-impact, and who should get to participate in something high-impact. Related to this, it was important to track percentages of students who did research. QEP went to an AACNU meeting, then applied for permission to initiate the current QEP plan. The plan came to define “high-impact experiences” as “immersive student experiences that deepen knowledge and hone skills in and beyond the classroom.” NC State students think and do many things, and the majority of what they do is internships. But students say that access to these experiences is not equitable. The data says that there are knowledge gaps in what students are aware of, and the QEP plan proposes to help students articulate their high-impact

experiences. The plan objectives emphasize career-readiness preparation and reflection for students as well. QEP is doing focus groups to talk to students about barriers, especially regarding imposter syndrome, time to degree, finances for study abroad experiences, etc. Also, students are receiving conflicting information about high-impact experiences. QEP is running a pilot program involving Wicked Problems, Wolfpack Solutions classes to help disseminate student information more evenly, and working on a professional development series for faculty. Hurlburt mentioned pulling together grants to assist facilitators of high-impact experiences, as well as for the experiences themselves. But what would happen when the QEP ended? Hurlburt hopes to work with development to ensure continued funding beyond the length of the plan. She said it was also a goal to work with student advisors to raise student awareness. SACS is coming to campus this spring, so QEP developed a summary paper regarding high-impact experiences and why NC State would be focusing on them as part of the current QEP. Levy asked about cost of experiences for students, and remarked that Wolfpack Solutions could be a nice way to begin to achieve a low-cost solution to an issue.

A. Hergeth raised the topic of the Admin Save Memo and asked for final questions before a vote. H. Hergeth moved to vote, and the motion to approve the memo carried.

Harrington brought up the ungrading question, and mentioned Marcus had composed a memo clarifying the issue as it related to CIM. Levy asked for a positive rather than a negative term for the topic, perhaps like “collaborative assessment,” to acknowledge student contributions and agency in the process. Duggins mentioned that popular terms would change over time, and that an umbrella term for many different words, preferably positive, could be used in the memo and in CIM. Harrington and Marcus brainstormed on clarifying the language in the memo. Schaffer thanked Marcus for her work, and Marcus said she would do the same for CUE. She suggested sending an updated document to the committee.

Meeting adjourned: 2:28 PM.

Respectfully submitted by Lydia Christoph